

Appln. No.: 10/686,863
Amendment Dated October 3, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2007

BSI-538US (formerly 021630-000522US)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appln. No: 10/686,863
Applicant: Michael V. Chobotov et al.
Filed: October 16, 2003
Title: DELIVERY SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR BIFURCATED GRAFT
TC/A.U.: 3738
Examiner: Thomas Sweet
Confirmation No.: 7447
Docket No.: BSI-538US (formerly 021630-000522US)

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR INFORMATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action dated May 3, 2007 and the August 24, 2007 Notice of Non-Fully Responsive Reply, Applicants provide the following Remarks.

Remarks/Arguments:

The August 24, 2007 Notice of Non-Fully Responsive Reply indicates that the reply filed on July 5, 2007 was not fully responsive to the May 3, 2007 Office Action because the reply did not identify the specific claims of those applications and/or patents which may present double patenting issues with the instant application claims and the example double patenting rejections were not addressed.

In response to the requirement to identify the specific claims of those applications and/or patents which may present double patenting issues with the instant application claims, Applicants respectfully submit that any of the claims in any of the applications or patents identified in the May 3, 2007 Office Action or in the July 5, 2007 Reply may present double patenting issues with the instant application claims by virtue of such applications or patents having a common inventor with the present application. Applicants do not make any comments as to whether any of these claims do or do not present a double patenting issue. With the identification of such applications and patents, the Examiner has all of the information necessary to review the claims and make a determination if double patenting exists with respect to any claims. In view of Applicants' identification of such patents and applications, and Applicants' submission of this known and reasonably available factual information, Applicants respectfully submit that this Response is fully responsive to every appropriate request in the Office Action.

With respect to the example double patenting rejections not being addressed, Applicants respectfully note that a double patenting rejection has not been raised in any Office Action to date. Upon receipt of an Office Action rejecting any claim based on double patenting, Applicants will address such with an appropriate response.

If the Examiner believes other factual information is necessary to the examination, the Examiner is invited to issue a follow up requirement setting forth the specific factual information being required, the form the required information is to take, and how the information is necessary to the examination as set forth in MPEP §704.14(a).


Appln. No.: 10/686,863
Amendment Dated October 3, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2007

BSI-538US (formerly 021630-000522US)

It is respectfully submitted that the information provided in this Response is fully responsive to every appropriate request in the Office Action. To the extent that this Response is not deemed responsive to a particular requirement, a Petition filed concurrently herewith requests withdrawal of such requirement.

Early consideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JLC', is written over a horizontal line.

Joshua L. Cohen, Reg. No. 38,040
Glenn M. Massina, Reg. No. 40,081
Attorneys for Applicants

JLC/GMM/ap
Dated: October 3, 2007